

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the final Office Action dated January 24, 2007, Claims 1-49 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0169695 to Salo et al. (“Salo”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,032,003 to Shi et al. (“Shi”). As an initial matter, Claims 14 and 26-33 have been amended to correct typographical errors. No new matter is presented and no new issues are raised by these amendments; as such, the amendments should be entered and considered at this juncture. As explained below, Applicant respectfully submits that the claimed invention of independent Claims 1, 14, 25, 34, and 43, and by dependency Claims 2-13, 15-24, 26-33, 35-42, and 44-49 are patentably distinct from the cited references, viewed alone or in combination. As such, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the pending claims of the present application.

Independent Claims 1, 14, 25, and 43 of the present application generally recite, amongst other things, that the mobile terminal executes a web server application that provides for a remote network device to access the mobile terminal via a network connection. Specifically, independent Claim 1 recites a “mobile terminal apparatus . . . comprising . . . a web server application.” Independent Claim 14 recites “providing a mobile terminal that implements a web server application,” “initiating a web browser application at a remote network device,” and “accessing, at the remote network device, the mobile terminal via a network connection to the web server application of the mobile terminal.” Independent Claim 25 recites “a web server application executed by the mobile terminal.” Independent Claim 43 recites “a mobile terminal including a first data processing device that executes a web server application” and “a remote network device including a second data processor device that executes a web browser application that provides access to the web server application of the mobile terminal.” Although independent Claim 34 does not specifically recite a “web server,” Claim 34 is directed to such an application that is capable of providing a remote network device access to a mobile terminal, and of providing the accessed remote network device functional access to one or more devices associated with the mobile terminal.

As is well known in the art, a “web server” application comprises software that is configured to accept HTTP requests from clients (e.g., devices executing web browsers) and

serve the clients HTTP responses along with optional data contents, such as web pages or other HTML documents and linked objects. *See, e.g.*, http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/web_server. When rejecting the claims of the present application, the Examiner appears to either be ignoring the “web server” recitation in the claims or is mischaracterizing the teachings of the cited references. For example, when rejecting independent Claim 1, the final Office Action submits that Salo discloses “a data processing device that executes a web server application that provides for a remote network device to access the mobile terminal via a wireless communication link.” *See* the final Office Action, page 3, paragraph 1. However, by making such a statement, the final Office Action ignores the fact that Claim 1 is directed to a mobile terminal and that the claim recites that the mobile terminal comprises the data processing device and the web server application. Although Salo may disclose a server that provides for communication between a remote device and a mobile terminal, the server in Salo is not the mobile terminal, as is the case in the claimed invention. The final Office Action fails to recognize that independent Claims 1, 14, 25, and 43 recite that the mobile terminal includes a web server application that provides for a remote device to access the mobile terminal (the remote device using, for example, a web browser application). The Salo publication does not, in any way, describe a mobile terminal having a web server application for permitting network devices to remotely access the mobile terminal, as is generally required by the independent claims of the present application.

Similarly, the Shi patent describes a system in which a wireless computing device, such as a PDA, is used to access a database on a server hosted by some other network device. In particular, the Shi patent is directed to synchronizing data on a wireless device with a database in a network server. For example, the wireless device sends a synchronization request to the server. The server receives the request, validates the request, updates the database on the server, and sends a synchronization response to the wireless device. Thus, the Shi patent also does not describe a mobile terminal having a web server application that permits a remote network device to access the mobile terminal, as generally required by the claims of the present application. Instead, like the Salo publication, the Shi patent specifically discloses the opposite of the claimed invention, by disclosing a mobile terminal that accesses a remote server.

Appl. No.: 10/752,891
Amdt. dated 03/22/2007
Reply to Office Action of January 24, 2007

Therefore, since neither cited reference discloses a mobile terminal having a web server application that provides a remote device with access to the mobile terminal (or devices associated with the mobile terminal), no combination of the cited references discloses a mobile terminal having such a web server application. As such, Applicants request that the Examiner withdraw the current rejections of the independent claims and either conduct a new search or allow the application.

Conclusion

In view of the remarks and amendments presented above, it is respectfully submitted that the claims of the present application are in condition for allowance. It is respectfully requested that a Notice of Allowance be issued in due course. The Examiner is requested to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney to resolve any remaining issues in order to expedite examination of the present application.

It is not believed that extensions of time or fees for net addition of claims are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 CFR § 1.136(a), and any fee required therefore (including fees for net addition of claims) is hereby authorized to be charged to Deposit Account No. 16-0605.

Respectfully submitted,



Christopher W. McAvoy
Registration No. 57,055

Customer No. 00826
ALSTON & BIRD LLP
Bank of America Plaza
101 South Tryon Street, Suite 4000
Charlotte, NC 28280-4000
Tel Charlotte Office (704) 444-1000
Fax Charlotte Office (704) 444-1111

ELECTRONICALLY FILED USING THE EFS-WEB ELECTRONIC FILING SYSTEM OF THE UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE ON March 22, 2007.

LEGAL02/30122888v1